

## 9. WESTERN SINOLOGY AND FIELD JOURNALS

This section of has two parts. The first outlines some aspects of the history of sinology in the West relevant to the contemporary shape of the field. The second part surveys some of the leading and secondary sinological journals, with emphasis on the role they have played historically.

### **I. An outline of sinological development in the West**

The history of sinology in the West is over 400 years old. No substantial survey will be attempted here; that can wait until publication of *The Lives of the Great Sinologists*, a blockbuster for sure.<sup>1</sup> At present, with Chinese studies widely dispersed in hundreds of teaching institutions, the lines of the scholarly traditions that once marked sharply divergent approaches are not as easy to discern as they were thirty or forty years ago, but they still have important influences on the agendas of the field, and they should be understood in broad outline. One survey approach is offered by the general introduction to Zurndorfer's guide; its emphasis is primarily on the development of modern Japanese and Chinese scholarly traditions, and it is well worth reading. This brief summary has somewhat different emphases.

### **A. Sinology in Europe**

#### **The French school**

Until the beginning of the eighteenth century, Western views of China were principally derived from information provided by occasional travelers and by missionaries, particularly the Jesuits, whose close ties with the Ming and Ch'ing courts are engagingly portrayed by Jonathan Spence in his popular portraits, *The Memory Palace of Matteo Ricci* and *Emperor of China*. Neither group was motivated by a purely scholarly agenda, nor was there a strong interest in the dissemination of knowledge about China. Although a good deal of information did flow into Europe during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, little of it was systematic and most was either highly idealized, creating an image of China as an exotic land of calm and reason, or mildly demonized, creating images of a heathen society in dire need of well-funded religious inspiration. For the educated sector of European societies to undertake the study of China for its own sake would have required something that none of the early sojourners in China seemed interested in supplying: a dictionary.

The first steps towards such a dictionary were the writings of Joseph Prémare (1666-1736), a missionary and fine linguist who lived in China from 1698 and wrote monographs on pronunciation, orthography, and the first grammar of Chinese (the last of these was not actually published until 1831). Prémare may have been the first Westerner to appreciate the distinction between Classical and vernacular Chinese, a consequence of his interest in the text of Yuan dynasty semi-colloquial drama. This point was, of course, essential for any successful

---

<sup>1</sup>Since this was first written, such a book has, indeed, emerged: David B. Honey's *Incense at the Altar* (2001), listed under "Further reading," below. And sure enough, a decade later it's still listed among Amazon's top 1,552,587 best selling books.

dictionary. As it happened, Prémare's ability to grasp the point and produce his work at this time coincided with the first real sinological opportunity in European academics, in France.

Prior to the French Revolution, the sole center of "oriental" studies in France was the Collège royal, which became the Collège de France after the deluge. Until 1814 all oriental studies in the Collège were concerned with the Near East. However, well before that date, the leading Arabist at the Collège, Silvestre de Sacy (1758-1838), began to promote the establishment of a chair of Chinese, and even published articles on China himself to encourage further inquiry. When in 1813 an independent minded scholar named Jean-Pierre Abel-Rémusat (1788-1832) published an ambitious thesis on Chinese medicine, de Sacy felt he had the perfect man for the new position. The first chair in Chinese in the West was founded in 1814 at de Sacy's instigation, and on 16 January 1815, Rémusat began his inaugural lectures. He was 27. And in the royal library, to which he as a member of the Collège had unlimited access, Rémusat found Prémare's unpublished manuscripts. Employing these, Rémusat was able to create the earliest set of reference tools for academic use in the west.

Rémusat stands first in a line of eminent chairs of Chinese at the Collège, and their names and academic strengths are central to the story of French sinology, the senior lineage in the field. Only five people (all men, naturellement) held this position prior to World War II:

Rémusat: Apart from his work in making Chinese grammar and vocabulary accessible to future scholars, Rémusat's interest was principally in the areas of Buddhism and Sino-Indian contacts. His leadership guided French sinology towards an early focus on China in terms of its links to Central Asia. (Rémusat died in the cholera epidemic of 1832; his translation of Fa-hsien's 法顯 account of his pilgrimage to India was not published until 1836.)

Stanislas Julien (1797-1873): Despite his fame for a Latin translation of the *Mencius*, Julien shared Rémusat's interest in Buddhism and published a translation of Hsuan-tsang's pilgrimage record. He also explored popular literature and theater, like Prémare.

Hervey de Saint-Denys (1823-1893): Least well known of the sinological patriarchs, Saint-Denys encouraged attention to poetry, particularly of the T'ang.

Edouard Chavannes (1865-1918): Chavannes was the first of the French school to travel to China for the purpose of research (as opposed to training and acculturation). Known as a Han specialist, his translation of the *Shih-chi* is an icon of the field. Beginning from Chavannes, the works of the major figures of the French school remain important and continue to be studied.

Henri Maspero (1883-1945): Maspero's influence on the field of sinology was multi-faceted. During twelve years of residence at the French academy in Hanoi (see the entry on *BMFEA* below), Maspero developed a double interest in high Confucian culture, and also in the less visible ideologies of popular culture. His history of Classical China became a standard in the field, though its relatively

uncritical treatment of sources makes it no longer useful as history, but in his studies of *Tao-tsang* 道藏 texts he also did more than any other single person to lay foundations for the study of religious Taoism. (His 1927 history of Classical China and a posthumous book on Taoism have recently been translated into English.) Maspero was arrested as a subversive by the Nazis and imprisoned in the Buchenwald concentration camp where he died. Maspero's student Paul Demiéville (1894-1979) succeeded him as chair and enjoyed a very productive career.

These occupants of the most prestigious academic post within French sinology were by no means the only great French sinologists of their age. In fact, at the time of the Second World War, most sinologists would have named Paul Pelliot (1878-1945) as the greatest sinologist of all time (*le sinologue babe-ruthien*). Pelliot was a formidable linguist who combined facility in a dozen languages with an expeditionary spirit and keen analytic abilities. He published on an enormous range of topics, emphasizing the importance of exacting detail and scrupulous accuracy. His ability with languages led him to pursue the French tradition of exploring China's interactions with Central Asian cultures. Along with the English archaeologist Sir Aurel Stein (1862-1944), Pelliot managed, in the removal of thousands of manuscripts from the caves of Tun-huang to France, to relieve China of more of its cultural treasures than any other individuals prior to Chiang Kai-shek.

Pelliot's style of scholarship became one model of a sinological ideal (much post-war American scholarship was very much a reaction against its perceived narrowness – it is not without significance that Pelliot, who was famous for his monumental footnotes, never actually published a book). But French sinology was not a monolithic tradition. A major contemporary of Pelliot, Marcel Granet (1889-1940), who was a student of the sociologist Emile Durkheim as well as of Chavannes, wrote big, exciting, and comparatively sloppy books with tremendously stimulating hypotheses. Granet spent little time in China and his work is generally theoretical and synthetic. Yet despite his lapses and his urge for the “big idea,” his writings remain very stimulating – his wonderful book on the *Shih ching*, translated into English as *Festivals and Songs of Ancient China*, may be the best example. (Granet's impact went beyond the China field; the anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss acknowledged him as a prime influence on his own work.)

The disparate scholarship of people like Pelliot and Granet (with Maspero representing something of a mean between the two) was mediated by field-builders such as Henri Cordier (1849-1925). Cordier, who knew virtually no Chinese, was connected to l'École nationale des langues orientales vivantes, established in 1795 to train aspiring businessmen and diplomats in vernacular Chinese and topics of practical import. Himself a businessman's son who spent many years in China helping his father prosper and avoiding language competence, Cordier transferred his entrepreneurial energies to two projects of great importance to the foundation of the sinological field. The more spectacular of these was the compilation of a massive bibliography of Western sinology (#24 on your list of contemporary bibliographical sources – in his China days, Cordier had been a friend of Alexander Wylie, whose bibliography, #23, was the first such Western example). The more enduring of Cordier's projects was the establishment in 1890, along

with Gustave Schlegel (1840-1903) of the University of Leiden in the Netherlands, of the journal *T'oung Pao*, which remains the leading sinological journal of Europe today.

Until World War II, France was the unchallenged center of sinological studies in the West. And the influence of pre-war French sinology and its related field of Central Asian studies continues to be important in a variety of teaching institutions outside France.

### **Sinology elsewhere in Europe**

*The Netherlands.* From the time of the founding of *T'oung Pao*, sinology in Holland, and particularly at the University of Leiden, has in some respects acted as a distinctive but closely linked northern wing of the French school. Dutch sinology has exerted an influence completely out of proportion to the small size of Holland.

Schlegel, co-founder with Cordier of *T'oung Pao*, was a brilliant scholar with a wide range of interests, which, to the consternation of a number of his colleagues, included research into secret societies and prostitution. The received wisdom is that Schlegel was a bad character, but his two-volume treatise on Chinese astronomy remains an important resource, while his specific sins are largely forgotten.

Among the most prominent of early Dutch sinologists were J.J.M. De Groot (1854-1921), whose multi-volume *The Religion of the Chinese* was the first sustained probe into Chinese popular religious ideas and tales, J.L. Duyvendak (1889-1954), who specialized in Classical thought and society, and R.H. van Gulik (1910-67), a diplomat and formidable amateur who seems to have inherited Schlegel's role as the foremost scholar of Chinese sexual arts and erotica. (Van Gulik is equally well known for his popular series of original Judge Dee mystery stories, modeled on a Ch'ing detective novel).

The University of Leiden remains a center of sinological research with broad influence. Dutch sinologists have traditionally published in English, for the most part, making their work accessible to a wide audience. The Leiden publishing house E.J. Brill, publisher of *T'oung Pao*, became from an early date the chief English-language publication outlet for Dutch sinology (despite a marketing strategy that appears to target exclusively libraries and plutocrats).

*England.* The advent of sinology in England was more heavily and longer indebted to the activities of missionaries than was the case in France. This relationship is best symbolized in the figure of the Scotsman James Legge (1814-1895), the doyen of British sinology during the latter part of the nineteenth century. Legge was first put in charge of the Protestant Theological Seminary in Hong Kong in 1843, and remained in China for many years, until returning to England and assuming the chair of Chinese studies at Oxford in 1876. While in China, Legge undertook to master Classical Chinese and prepare a full translation of the entire Confucian canon, an enterprise in which he was much aided by his Chinese collaborator, Wang T'ao 王韜 (1828-1897). The result was so outstanding that although Legge has been dead well over a century, his translations are still important and, in the case of the *Tso-chuan* and *Li-chi*, his remain the only complete published translations in English (though a full translation of the *Tso* is now well advanced towards publication).

Legge's classicism established a predominantly conservative tone in British sinology, which despite important contributions to the study of Buddhism by men such as Aurel Stein and William Soothill (1861-1935), a successor of Legge's at Oxford, remained very much dominated by a Confucian worldview. This was reinforced by the unique career of Arthur Waley (1889-1968), a self-taught master of both Chinese and traditional Japanese literature. A print cataloguer at the British Museum and member of the famous London Bloomsbury Group literary circle, Waley never traveled to East Asia and yet managed to achieve so coherent and engaging a sympathy with its literary traditions that his translations and very literate biographical studies are hard to surpass. Waley is the only sinologist of such stature never to hold an academic position. His great reputation did lead Cambridge to offer him a chair in Chinese studies despite his non-academic background, but Waley declined it. "I'd rather be dead," he said.

It is an odd fact that the two greatest names in British sinology were a missionary and a cataloguer. But in truth, British academic sinology never developed the strength of the French tradition, and Waley's distaste for the life of the Cambridge don is understandable in light of state of sinology at the time. In his droll account of British sinology, *Singular Listlessness*, T.H. Barrett recounts a series of academic misadventures that are hard to top among accounts of scholarly ineptness. Barrett notes that the first chair of Chinese in Britain, the Reverend Samuel Kidd (1799-1843), who was appointed at the University of London, revealed the depth of his sinological skills by cataloguing the romance *San-kuo yen-yi* 三國演義 as a "statistical work." The third of the British sinological chairs, the Cambridge position that Waley would much later decline, was established for Sir Thomas Wade (1818-1895), the great transcription formulator, as a quid pro quo for Wade's donation of his private library. Wade held Legge's scholarship in low regard, and this prompted his successor, Herbert Giles (1845-1935), to remark, "In my opinion, Legge's work . . . will be remembered and studied ages after Sir Thomas Wade's own paltry contribution has gone, if indeed it has not already gone, to the dustheap." Giles, of course, is best known as a suffix following Wade. During his career at Oxford Giles had one advanced student, whose identity is unknown.

British sinology benefitted greatly from the influence of refugee scholars who fled Germany and Axis occupied countries during World War II (see the listing for the periodical *Asia Major* below). A number of eminent native-born and British-trained sinologists ultimately emerged, such as A.C. Graham (1919-91), Michael Loewe (1922 - ), and Denis Twitchett (1925-2006). But again, perhaps the greatest among all British sinologists has, like Legge and Waley, turned out to be something of an academic outsider – Joseph Needham (1900-1995), after all, was a biologist.

*Sweden.* Several important sinological traditions have been nourished in European countries not often considered central to the world academic community, while other countries that one might expect to have major roles in the growth of sinology for one reason or another did not.

Among the most important schools of sinology is that of Sweden, chiefly a function of the enormous contributions of Bernhard Karlgren (1889-1978), who taught at the University of Göteborg. Karlgren was the founder, along with the mining engineer-turned-archaeologist Gunnar Andersson (1874-1960), of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities in Stockholm, which



was opened in 1926. The bulletin of the museum became the principal outlet for the major works of Swedish sinology, chiefly Karlgren's until the late 1950s, and later those of the Swedish sinologists such as the historian Hans Bielenstein (1920 - ), who emigrated to America and taught at Columbia.

Reflecting the direction set by Karlgren and Andersson, Swedish sinology has been heavily weighted towards research on early China, and has emphasized a balance of archaeological, philological, and textual studies. Like the Dutch (and the Czechs below), Swedish sinologists have generally published in English.

*Czechoslovakia.* One of the saddest stories of European sinology concerns the fate of the once-vibrant Czech school of sinology. The towering figure of this tradition was Jaroslav Průšek (1906-1980), who studied with Karlgren at Göteborg during the 1920s. Průšek, unlike his mentor, had wide-ranging interests that encompassed the entire range of Chinese history, including contemporary studies. He published books on Chou period ethnic politics on the Chinese perimeter, on the rise of vernacular literature during the Ming, and on the communist literature of revolutionary China. An entrepreneurial type, Průšek mobilized resources in Prague that made the university there one of the centers of European sinology, producing outstanding researchers, such as Timoteus Pokora (1928-85), and turning the Czech sinological journal, *Archiv Orientální*, into a major international outlet for scholarship.

In 1968, Průšek was in the United States when the Soviet army invaded Czechoslovakia. Despite the fact that his previous activities guaranteed he would be persona non grata, he returned to Prague. The new regime stripped Průšek of his post, all opportunities for meaningful work, and any prospect of escape elsewhere. In the mid-1970s it was reported that he had been encountered working as a waiter. After his death, the Sung specialist Yves Hervouet wrote, "Průšek did not know the concentration camp, as had Maspero, but he knew a slow death through the silence of twelve years, far from the library he had founded, to which he was no longer admitted."

Five years later, Pokora, who had also been dismissed from his position at the end of the "Prague Spring," died prematurely. In 1988, *Archiv Orientální*, despite having over the previous two decades published many important celebrations of the contribution of Marxist dialectics to sinology, died as well, followed a year later by the Communist regime.

*Germany.* Early German sinology, while not as developed as the French school, was nevertheless among the leading national traditions in the discipline. Perhaps the most famous representative of German sinology was Richard Wilhelm (1873-1930), an admirer of the psychologist Carl Jung whose semi-Jungian translation of the *Yi ching* (available in English translation) may be the best thing ever to result from Jung's theories. Wilhelm was both a missionary and an academic. As a missionary, he directed a church school in Shantung for many years. Wilhelm's gradual conversion from missionary to a maven of Chinese culture is well expressed in a remark he reportedly made to the Neo-Confucian scholar Carson Chang, "It is a consolation to me that as a missionary I failed to convert a single Chinese."

Wilhelm was not the only sinologist of note in Germany. Otto Franke (1863-1946) of the University of Berlin produced an important multi-volume history of China – publication began in 1930, but with the disruptions of the rise of the Nazi regime and the war that followed, it was not completed until 1952, well after Franke's death. Sinological chairs were also established in major universities in Leipzig, Munich, and elsewhere.

Between the wars, the best of German sinology was represented by the journal *Asia Major* (the name was originally pronounced as Latin: *a-zee-ya mai-yur*; the pronunciation still has the power to impress or repel people at cocktail parties), edited by Bruno Schindler (1881-1964). However, with the rise of the Nazi Party, sinology in Germany effectively came to a close as scholars were dismissed from their positions on the basis of impure blood or ideas. The leading German sinologists managed to emigrate. Schindler himself moved to England, where *Asia Major* was reincarnated, and he was joined there by Walter Simon (1893-1981) and Gustav Haloun (1898-1952), two other leading figures. Étienne Balasz (1905-63), a brilliant young Hungarian historian who had begun his career in Germany, fled from the Nazis and lived underground in France during the war, remaining there afterwards as a member of the Sorbonne. Karl Wittfogel (1896-1988) and Wolfram Eberhard (1909-1989) left for America, where their influence – Wittfogel at Columbia and the University of Washington and Eberhard at Berkeley – was enormous.

Germany itself was left almost completely without scholars of note. It was only slowly and with much effort that German sinology was rebuilt after the war by a younger generation of scholars, such as Wolfgang Franke (son of Otto, 1912-2007) at Hamburg and Wolfgang Bauer (1930-1997) at Munich. Even so, German scholarship tended to remain somewhat remote because it has continued to be predominantly published in German as the general field became increasingly dominated by English readers. While the power of the French school has made it imperative for all sinologists to learn French, Germany did not develop a strong enough sinological reputation to attract equal commitment to German. Nevertheless, over the past three decades scholars trained in Germany have attained an increasingly high sinological profile, in part because the end of the East German regime and its isolation has permitted the emergence of scholars who would in the past have been unable to participate fully in international scholarship.

*Russia.* No sinological school of major influence emerged from Russia during the twentieth century despite the fact that Russia was among the early developing centers of sinology during the nineteenth. There are three reasons why this is so. As in the German case, political disruptions early in the century led to the emigration of a substantial portion of the intelligentsia; thus people like Serge Elisséeff (1889-1975; the first Harvard director of the Harvard-Yenching Institute, an independent unit established in 1928 at Harvard with funding from the owner of the Alcoa Aluminum Corporation) and Peter Boodberg (1903-72; a brilliant and eccentric philological iconoclast at Berkeley) wound up pursuing careers outside their native Russia. Second, Marxist ideology had the same deadening effect on free inquiry in Russian scholarship that it did in the case of China. Only academic areas well insulated from political significance, such as linguistics, could develop in such a way as to make significant contributions to the international scholarly enterprise. Third, Russian scholarship tended to be published in Russian, a language that even Czars didn't use unless they had to. Thus many truly valuable contributions

made by Russian scholars remain known only by report in the West. (See the Rozman item in the source list below.)

These generalizations having been said, it should be noted that in two respects they must be modified. Due to the proximity of the eastern Soviet Union to the regions occupied by the northern and western neighbors of traditional China, Russian scholars have profoundly influenced the archaeological and historical study of these cultures, which contemporary Chinese historians and philologists increasingly recognize as having been of far greater importance to China than Chinese writers themselves have acknowledged. In addition, in the area of historical linguistics, Russian scholars such as Sergei Starostin (1953-2005) have made significant contributions, facilitated by the relative accessibility of relevant living languages and the high valuation and advanced state of linguistics in Russian academic tradition – one which fostered such events as a national “Linguistics Olympics” for school children, which the young Starostin won.

*Australia.* Australia is not actually in Europe, but Australian sinology is very much in the European tradition and so it is appended to this account of European sinology.

Sinology in Australia has been chiefly developed at the Australian National University in Canberra, where training in Chinese language and, most prominently, history began in the 1950s. Although members of the A.N.U. departments of Far Eastern History and Chinese have generally been scholars who were trained abroad, the university has for two decades assembled one of the finest Chinese studies faculties in the world. A survey of the list of contributors to *Essays on the Sources for Chinese History* (noted in the History I section of course materials), most of whom are or have been members of the A.N.U. faculty, indicates the broad resources of the university, and other leading figures have joined the faculty since that time.

The state of sinology in Australia may also be gauged by surveying the A.N.U. journal *East Asian History*, listed in part II of this section. As that journal reveals, Australian sinology is written in English, despite the fact that few Australians are able to speak it with any success.

## **B. Chinese Studies in the United States**

There are currently some hundred colleges and universities in the United States which may be considered to have true programs in East Asian studies. Of these, perhaps 35 have significant Chinese Studies programs, though there are many leading scholars of Chinese Studies at institutions that have not developed extensive programs. (There are several excellent Canadian programs, notably the University of British Columbia, McGill University, and University of Toronto, but for brevity's sake, this account will not include Canada.)

Among the oldest programs in the U.S. are those at Yale, Columbia, and Berkeley, which date from soon before or after the turn of the century. By the time of the Second World War, a larger nucleus of programs had developed, principally in the East, with Chicago serving as a midwestern pivot, and growth was greatly accelerated by America's involvement in the Pacific



War. It was not until the late 1950s and early 1960s, however, that Chinese Studies in the U.S. began to take the shape that it now holds.

The growth of Chinese Studies in the U.S. has long been facilitated by the support of certain major foundations and by government support. During the late 1920s, the American Council of Learned Societies noted the backwardness of American understanding of China and began to support the development of Chinese Studies. Sinologists such as George Kennedy (1901-60; trained by Haloun, appointed at Yale) and Derk Bodde (1909-2003; trained by Duyvendak, appointed at University of Pennsylvania) were able to pursue studies in China through ACLS grants as early as the 1930s. Among those they encountered there was John Fairbank (1907-91), an Oxford Ph.D. student from America. Fairbank was the most important, though not the sole influence in major changes in post-war American approaches to China that gave Chinese studies in the United States a dramatically new and influential shape.

Prior to World War II, the study of China in America was pursued along the lines of European sinology. The early writings of Bodde and the work of George Kennedy serve as examples, as does the work of Boodberg at Berkeley and Herrlee Creel (1905-94) of the University of Chicago. Some of their work bore comparison to European sinology, but there was a very small pool of aspiring scholars in the field, and no background tradition that could produce scholarship at the level of a Pelliot or Maspero.

Although some early U.S. sinologists held appointments in history, government, anthropology, or art history departments, most were located in Oriental Language and Literature departments and only these departments offered coherent degree programs. Chinese area faculty in other departments only worked together on an informal or ad hoc basis. America's involvement in East Asia during the war yielded numbers of young people with interest and experience in East Asia. Chinese and Japanese language programs experienced rapid post-war growth as these veterans returned to their studies under the G.I. bill, but most such students were seeking answers to questions about modern society and politics in East Asia that the faculty in language and literature departments had not been trained to address. East Asian specialists in various "disciplinary" departments (history, sociology, political science, and so forth) responded by creating interdisciplinary "area studies" centers that began to free the study of Japan and China from the confines of language departments. These centers were, at first, principally devoted to the study of Japan, which, as an enemy country, had been intensively analyzed by military and government personnel during the war, and which U.S. forces occupied for nearly a decade afterward. But China centers followed as the 1949 Revolution made China a major U.S. preoccupation. In 1956, the Harvard Center for East Asian Studies was established (now the Fairbank Center for East Asian Research), and its China wing quickly began to compete with the sinological Harvard-Yenching Institute.

Fairbank, along with the Japanese historian Edwin Reischauer (later an American ambassador to Japan), created a dynamic new instructional program in East Asian studies based on the principles of inter-disciplinary area studies (textbooks derived from their basic courses are still important in the teaching of East Asia). Given the excellence of the Harvard student body at all levels from which Fairbank and Reischauer could recruit converts to the cause of East Asian

studies, it is no surprise that the profession was within a decade repopulated with a young cadre of assistant and associate professors devoted to this non-sinological approach to East Asia.

The growth of area studies programs also facilitated the rapid emergence of strong programs at institutions that had little pre-war strength in Chinese Studies. Private foundations such as the Ford and Mellon foundations, and steadily increasing federal funding allowed universities with strong general resources to refocus their priorities on East Asia and build up area studies with remarkable speed. The University of Michigan, for example, possessed virtually no Chinese Studies program until the mid-1950s; but it had established the first Japanese Studies center in 1947 and on the basis of this managed to attract funding to support the building of a Chinese Studies program. By 1961, it had established its Center for Chinese Studies and begun a program of library building that took its East Asian collection from the seventeenth largest in the country in that year to the second largest by the 1980s. A similar burst of program growth occurred at the University of Washington.

The engine that drove these newer programs, and older programs that undertook rapid expansion with foundation and government funding, tended to be the social sciences, beginning with political science. During the 1950s, the issue of Chinese politics became an obsession of a large sector of the American public. Anti-communist politicians such as Joseph McCarthy blamed “old China hands” in the U.S. State Department for subversive behavior that led to the “loss” of China to the communists. Leading academics who had acted as advisors during the war, such as the historian Owen Lattimore, were driven from their positions and, in Lattimore’s case, from the country, and John Fairbank, who had been a key member of the War Information Office and a friend of many in the China diplomatic corps, was repeatedly called from Harvard to Washington to defend his role. This focus on China spurred a sudden growth of interest in understanding both traditional and contemporary China in modern political terms, and major institutions began to develop programs in Chinese politics with either liberal (e.g. Harvard, Michigan) or conservative (Washington, Stanford) biases.

The interest in China as an object of political analysis coincided with the self-conscious development of social science research in the United States. At the outset of the post-war era, social science-oriented Asian specialists, finding the century-old American Oriental Society (AOS) too philologically oriented to accommodate their interests, had formed the Association for Asian Studies (AAS), intended to broaden the scope and methods of inquiry to include both humanistic and social science approaches. In 1951, the AAS created a Committee on Chinese Thought to “examine Chinese traditions of thought against the history of characteristic Chinese institutions and patterns of behavior.” This effectively commissioned historians to carry the approach of the modern social sciences from the study of contemporary society into the study of the Chinese past, previously the province of sinologists alone. By the end of the decade, the Committee had produced a remarkable series of volumes reexamining traditional China in an analytic style that became distinctive of American approaches to Chinese Studies. These volumes, edited chiefly by Arthur Wright (1913-1976; Stanford, Yale), David Nivison (1923 - ; Stanford, now emeritus), Denis Twitchett (1925-2006; then at Cambridge University, later at Princeton), and Fairbank are among the finest products of American scholarship on China and remain well worth reading (the titles are: *Confucianism in Action*, *Studies in Chinese Thought*, *The Confucian Persuasion*, *Confucian Thought and Institutions*, *Confucian Personalities*; perhaps some might

mark how the titles suggest a departure from the French school of Pelliot and Maspero). At a time when the Chinese sector of the AOS was nearly moribund, these volumes simply captured the field of Chinese humanistic studies under the aegis of historians oriented towards the social science approach.

As these studies, principally the work of historians, came into print, members of the more “hard core” (often more quantitative) social sciences began to publish studies employing new styles of analysis that provided exciting new perspectives on Chinese society. Perhaps the work that had the greatest impact was a study by the anthropologist G. William Skinner (1925-2008; then at Cornell, later Stanford), “Marketing and Social Structure in Rural China,” published serially as the lead article in three consecutive issues of the *Journal of Asian Studies* (1964-65). Skinner’s study was such a tour de force in demonstrating the power of social science that despite the fact that some of its findings have since been challenged, it remains an awe inspiring experience to read through it today. If you do so, you may understand why at the time of its publication, the new historical/social science corps of post-war scholars felt ready to mount a direct and fierce challenge to the traditions of European sinology.

In 1964, at the time that Skinner’s articles were in press and already widely anticipated, the AAS sponsored a conference panel and published symposium that constituted an all-out attack on the “footnote scholarship” of Pelliot and his ilk by leading figures of the newly emergent American school, such as Fairbank’s student Joseph Levenson (1920-1969) and Skinner. These leaders of the new school essentially claimed that all cultural studies were inherently comparative, and that the “steeped-in-culture” standard of sinology, while ideally desirable in itself, was unrealistic if scholars wished in a lifetime to produce work that addressed “important” questions. Only the lone voice of Frederick Mote (1922-2005; Princeton), who had been trained in sinology at the University of Washington, defended the older tradition, claiming that its perceived narrowness was largely an illusion, and that mastery of Chinese cultural history entailed addressing issues very much like those important to Fairbankians. (In presenting his defense of sinology, Mote actually exposed a rift in American sinology by simultaneously attacking the pristinely sinological Edward Schafer (1913-1991), who had earlier published an open letter attempting to rebut attacks on traditional sinology by asserting its character as true “sinology” – somewhat comparable to asking Democrats in 2010 to defend their party, under attack for its liberalism, by renaming it the Liberal Party.)

As mentioned earlier, the proliferation of Fairbank students in major programs spread the new gospel. The boldest thinker among them, Joseph Levenson, brought his dizzyingly ambitious approach to Berkeley, where he founded a tradition of grand synthesis that ran fully counter to the prevailing sinology of the Boodberg-Schafer inspired Department of Oriental Languages. Albert Feuerwerker (Michigan, now emeritus), a Fairbank student specializing in economic history, founded Michigan’s China Center along with the economist Alexander Eckstein (1915-76); their promotion of the new agenda was so effective that within a little more than a decade Michigan had two economists and three political scientists specializing in China (not to mention four historians, an anthropologist, and a sociologist), compared to four faculty members in language and literature. While many of the leaders of the new area studies approach, particularly historians, were very well trained in language and research methods, an increasing number of younger scholars in strictly social science areas found they could succeed in

addressing the agendas of their fields with little training in language or cultural studies. Consequently, although people like Levenson and Feuerwerker produced scholarship of great erudition, others who tried to address major aspects of the problematik of Chinese Studies produced some less than impressive work.

There were, throughout, a few institutions that were not overwhelmed by the Fairbankian tide. The University of Washington, with a political bent far removed from Harvard's, developed along independent lines, much influenced by the German-trained historian Karl Wittfogel (1896-1988). At Columbia, the entrepreneurship of Theodore de Bary (1919 - ; now emeritus) in the area of philosophical studies resulted in the growth of a distinctive and influential faculty focused on Neo-Confucian studies, informed by both sinological and social science traditions. And throughout the period of even the highest social science influence, the study of traditional Chinese literature continued to reflect established patterns focused on biographical studies and literary interpretation.

The divergence in academic approaches to China between institutions, departments, and individual scholars was greatly complicated by the political environment of the period of the Vietnam War. Ideological battles added the element of generational conflict to an intellectual battleground. Fairbank and many of his students, now leaders in their own right, who had been seen as political radicals in the 1950s now found themselves cast as cold warrior conservatives by anti-war members of the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, some of whom were pushed in the direction of support of the Maoist regime in China (whose Cultural Revolution was generally misunderstood until the late 1970s). The social science camp of scholarship became itself split, with many younger members favoring a scholarship of political engagement. For them, the word "sinology" had an antiquarian and slightly humorous ring (that was the way in which the term was used when I was first training in the field).

During the late 1970s and early 1980s, Chinese Studies in America took a new turn. The close of the Vietnam War era and a massive disillusionment with China that followed revelation of the nature of the Cultural Revolution led to a calming of many internal conflicts in the field. Perhaps more important, increasing contacts between American and European scholars, fostered in part by increasing mutual access to the scholarship of mainland China, led to a gradual reemergence of sinological studies in the United States. New tools of philology and textual research created new possibilities for young scholars, while the grand projects of the social science-oriented historians began to lose some of their momentum. An awareness that gaps in language and cultural skills could place limits on what social science approaches could achieve led both funding agencies and Chinese Studies faculties to begin laying increased stress on language and literature programs that could ensure technical sophistication in those areas. As individuals acquired the skills that underlie philological and textual studies, inevitably the importance of the problems that can be addressed only at the level of those skills became increasingly apparent.

Moreover, despite some die-hard declamations of undying scorn by unreconstructed devotees of either approach, most sinologists in both Europe and America had come to be greatly influenced by the discourse of the more social science-oriented approach, that linked interpretation of specific lives, events, or texts to an understanding of the evolution of institutions,

while those on the other side had come to understand the force of the sinological imperative of deep understanding of cultural paradigms and linguistic expertise. It should also be noted that European and American scholarship had never been so sharply divided as this outline portrait, by virtue of its brevity, has suggested. For example, scholars in France, echoing the traditions prefigured in the work of Granet, established a strong independent tradition of sociological inquiry in areas often thought of as principally arenas of humanistic inquiry. An example would be Jacques Gernet's remarkable study, *Les aspects économiques du Bouddhisme dans la société chinoise du V<sup>e</sup> au X<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Saigon: 1956). On the other side, American studies of traditional Chinese literature had, as mentioned earlier, maintained high standards of sinological excellence throughout.

In addition, a certain common ground was created by sharp criticisms that had been launched on *both* styles of scholarship. Traditionally oriented sinologists found themselves under sharp attack for participating in traditions labeled "Orientalist," after the influential book by Edward Said. The Fairbank school came under very similar types of criticism for its imposition of Western-derived models and issues on the Chinese case. Fairbank's own student, Paul Cohen, published a widely read critique of American historical studies of China that brought to the Chinese Studies field the same type of reflective reassessment that Said's book provoked among the more sinologically inclined.

Perhaps the greatest spur to the reassessment of the agenda of Chinese Studies in the U.S. was the tremendous growth in the area of Taoist research over the last decades of the twentieth century. As scholars in the tradition of Maspero continued to make Taoism and its canon accessible in France, and in the Kyoto branch of l'École des hautes études, the French research academy formerly in Hanoi, it became clear that Americans were losing out on the construction of one of the largest and most theoretically broad reaching fields of Chinese Studies. During the 1980s, the Boodberg-Schafer tradition at Berkeley reemerged into the forefront of Chinese Studies, reviving through Taoist Studies a new breed of the sinology that social science had so long kept at bay.

This is not so much a matter of ultimate triumph; there are many institutions where large contingents of area studies specialists go about their work with little appreciation of philology and associated approaches. But Chinese Studies in the United States is now so broadly based that there is space for different traditions to pursue their agendas in relative independence without necessarily coming into fierce competition for funding resources or publication space. The China wing of the American Oriental Society has revived over the past three decades, and the AOS and AAS now provide alternative contexts for scholarship. Not that the battles of the 1950s and 1960s have ended with a sterile division of the field – there is probably more interaction among different approaches now than ever before. But the view of the American – or the world – Chinese Studies field as a monolithic body of hierarchical authorities (Pelliot on top; Kidd and Wade on the bottom) has died out. The field is now viewed as institutionally pluralistic, pursuing various species of questions with different but appropriate methodologies – and sometimes the members of one wing of the field even benefit from studying and adapting methods developed for another.

*Indiana.* Chinese Studies at Bloomington began during the post-war period as part of an effort by the president of the time, Herman B Wells (1902-2000), to internationalize both the curriculum



and the student body in recognition of the dwindling of the age of nationalistic isolationism. Indiana had not previously built a foundation in East Asian area studies within disciplinary departments, and had no department for East Asian language instruction. Consequently, it was not in a position to attract the sorts of foundation and government funding that built the most prominent programs after the war.

Nevertheless, Indiana was very fortunate in its initial appointment. The historian Teng Ssu-yü (1906-1988) joined IU in 1950, having earned his doctorate under Fairbank in 1942. Teng had come to Harvard from Yenching University and after getting his Ph.D. had become Fairbank's collaborator in a variety of projects whose theme was well captured in the title of their joint monograph, *China's Response to the West*.

In 1961, Liu Wu-chi (1907-2002), a Yale Ph.D. who had taught at Nankai University prior to the 1949 revolution, joined the Indiana faculty and became the chair of a new Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures. Planning for the department had been coordinated by Joseph Sutton, a specialist in Chinese politics who later became president of the university.

Under Liu Wu-chi, Indiana developed a particular strength in Chinese literature, having at one point as many as five faculty specialists in Chinese literature on the faculty. Like most literature departments, it remained relatively untouched by the social science wave and pursued a combination of sinological and interpretive scholarship that was typical of the strongest language and literature programs of the 1960s and 1970s.

Unlike many large state institutions with significant China programs, Indiana was very late to add China positions in social science areas, and East Asian history was also under-represented. In general, despite a very strong campus tradition in foreign languages, the area studies model did not have the strong influence at Indiana that it did at institutions such as Harvard, Washington, and Michigan. For this reason, in the mid-1970s Indiana's languages and literatures department became one of the first to reconfigure itself as a department of languages and cultures, in an attempt to find a home for a more diverse East Asian faculty. Although this brought specialists in Chinese geography, Japanese politics, and Japanese and Korean history into the department, and opened department membership to faculty whose primary appointments were in history or the social sciences departments, Indiana's China program was, through the 1990s, characterized by unusual strength in the humanities and sinology, and unusual weakness in the social sciences – in some respects a surprising outcome, given the Fairbankian background of Teng Ssu-yü.

Over the past decade, however, there has been a dramatic shift at this campus. Appointments in China area social sciences have proliferated – new appointments have been made in politics, sociology (two), and anthropology (not to mention business and education) – while the program has suffered some significant losses in what had for twenty years become its area of signature strength: Chinese religion. Consequently, the current program now more closely resembles the balanced trends of other institutions.

#### **Further reading:**

In addition to these general field reviews, this account has drawn on various academic obituary notices in journals and, for the 2009 revision, online. Unlike the sources listed below, it is a casually assembled account, and not an authoritative product of research.

José Frèches, *La sinologie* (Paris: 1975)

Paul Demiéville, “Aperçu historique des études sinologiques en France,” *Acta Asiatica* 2 (1966), 56-100

J.J.L. Duyvendak, *Holland's Contribution to Chinese Studies* (London: 1950)

Jaroslav Průšek, “Fifty Years of Oriental Studies in Czechoslovakia,” *Archiv Orientální* 36.4 (1968), 529-34

T.H. Barrett, *Singular Listlessness: A Short History of Chinese Books and British Scholars* (London: 1989) – It may be noted that Barrett's mordantly dry account of the fecklessness of British sinology includes an errata sheet of 19 items for its 125 pages, and many more will be evident to the casual reader.

David Honey, *Incense at the Altar: Pioneering Sinologists and the Development of Classical Chinese Philology* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2001)

Gilbert Rozman, editor, *Soviet Studies of Premodern China* (Ann Arbor: 1984)

Harriet Zurndorfer, *China Bibliography* (Brill, 1995; Hawaii, 1999), 4-44.

## **II. Western sinological journals**

This section does not attempt to make a full survey of all journals in the field of sinology or Chinese Studies. It is intended to make you aware of a significant range of journals and of journal types. In some cases, journals are included because of their historical significance rather than for their current importance to the field.

Journals covered in this section are listed under the following categories:

1. General Sinological Journals
  - A. Founded Pre-World War I (Europe / U.S.)
  - B. Founded in the Interwar period (Europe / U.S.)
2. English language sinology journals in East Asia
3. Historical and social science Chinese Studies journals
4. Disciplinary journals
5. Historical small journals & newsletters (U.S.)
6. Review journal
7. Translation journal
8. News of the field

With a few exceptions, only journals still in publication are noted. Frequency of publication is for most recent years. Where journals have come to have standard abbreviations as cited in the field, these are indicated.

### **1. General Sinological Journals**

#### *A. Pre-World War I*

##### **i. Europe**

*JA*     *Journal asiatique*, 1822 - (annual), Paris: La Société asiatique [PJ 4 .J8]

*JA was initiated with the formation of the first of the orientalist societies, the Société asiatique, founded in 1822, one year before the British Royal Asiatic Society. Sinology in France was still in its first decade when the journal published its first issue. The first president of the Société, the Arabist Silvestre de Sacy (1758-1838), had been instrumental in securing a chair in Chinese at the Collège de France, and under his supervision JA included sinological articles from an early point. However, the sinological content of the journal grew weaker in the twentieth century, perhaps because of the founding of alternative journals more specifically devoted to sinology.*

*Articles in JA are in French with occasional ones in English; for the last decade or so, English summaries of French articles have been provided. It is not currently a major source of sinological scholarship, but articles on China do appear from time to time.*

*JRAS* *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 1834 - (three issues annually), London [PJ 3 .R8]

*The Royal Asiatic Society was founded in 1823, just one year after la Société asiatique in France. It has never been a major outlet for sinology (the Journal of the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society was for more important before its demise, but it is not held by IU). However, some sinological articles do appear.*

*ZDMG Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenlanthen gesellschaft* [Journal of the German Oriental Society], 1847 - (semi-annual), Leipzig; Munich [PJ 5 .D4]

*Like JA, ZDMG (and JAOS below) is the journal of an orientalist society founded early in the nineteenth century when sinology was in its infancy. Its range is broad and sinology is not among the strengths of the journal. Articles are published in German and English.*

*TP T'oung Pao*, 1890 - (semi-annual) (Series 1, 1890-99; Series 2, 1900 - ), Leiden [DS 501 .T7]

*TP was initially devoted to a broad-based review of scholarship on Asia in general, with a heavy emphasis on Central Asia, but always including a strong sinological component. Since the 1970s, TP has devoted itself solely to sinological articles and reviews (after 1978, it adopted a new subtitle specifying it was to be a sinological journal thereafter). Articles are in French, English, and occasionally German.*

*TP was initially the brainchild of Henri Cordier (1849-1925) and Gustav Schlegel (1840-1903). Cordier (who knew no Chinese), was a great bibliographer and popularizer of sinological scholarship in France, while Schlegel, a scholar of Chinese secret societies and astronomy, was the first professor to occupy a chair in Chinese at the University of Leiden. Their prestige gave the journal great appeal to scholars, and an arrangement that ultimately divided responsibility for the journal jointly between the University of Leiden and the Collège de France provided a type of double-barreled authority that no other journal could match. TP also gained important status in the field by virtue of the space it devoted (and continues to devote) to book reviews.*

*Editors of TP have been among the most outstanding sinologists of the Paris-Leiden tradition (which represents the core of what is generally referred to as "French sinology"). Apart from Cordier's tenure as founding editor (tenure as editor: 1890-1925), other outstanding editors have included Edouard Chavannes (1904-18), Paul Pelliot (1921-45), J.J.L. Duyvendak (1932-54), Paul Demiéville (1948-75), A.F.P. Hulséwé (1957-75), Jaques Gernet (1975-92), and Erik Zürcher (1975-92), many of these scholars in essence serving as editors-for-life.*

*Online through JSTOR (1890-2005) or all issues to current numbers through IngentaConnect:*

<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/0082-5433>

*BEFEO Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient*, 1901 - (annual),  
Hanoi, Saigon, Paris since 1954. [PJ 4 .E19]

*One of the defining features of French sinology during its heyday was the influence of l'École française d'Extrême-Orient, which was established in Hanoi in 1898. This research academy provided French sinologists with a fully equipped scholarly base at the periphery of China itself, and many of the most important French sinologists of the early twentieth century, most prominently Henri Maspero (1883-1945), spent long tenures there. The interest of French sinology in popular culture beyond the texts of the "great tradition," and in the peripheral ethnicities of China to the south and west, reflects the unique scholarly opportunities that this academy provided. No other European power employed its colonial advantages in East Asia in this manner. Of course, French scholars in the colonies were in even more direct contact with Southeast Asian cultures, and sinological works never comprised more than a portion of the contents of BEFEO.*

*After the fall of French colonial power in Vietnam in 1954, the journal relocated to Paris. From this point, the presence of sinological articles in the journal seems to have declined, although there appears to be a slight increase in the 1990s.*

*BEFEO articles are published in French, with an occasional English article.*

Online through Persee:

<http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/revue/befeo>  
(coverage: 1901-2003)

*BSOAS Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 1917 - (3 issues annually),  
London [PJ 3 .L84]

*Initial issues of BSOAS were marked by a large number of studies and translations by Arthur Waley (1889-1966), probably the single most effective popularizer of East Asian culture and history in the twentieth century. The journal's range was never confined to China, and, in fact, there have been large stretches of its history where very few sinological articles were included in its pages. Recently, BSOAS seems to have increased its sinological content, perhaps following up on its publication of several important studies by A.C. Graham during the 1980s. The journal includes a book review section.*

Online through JSTOR (coverage: 1940-2003 or 5 years before present), or  
1991-Current through CambridgeJournals:

<http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayJournal?jid=BSO>

## ii. United States

*JAOS Journal of the American Oriental Society* 1843 - (quarterly), New Haven [PJ 2 .A5]



*It is remarkable that a cultural backwater like early nineteenth century America would be able to sustain an orientalist journal, but Boston never easily accepted its provincial status, and this accounts for the establishment of the American Oriental Society (AOS) there in 1843 (the early issues of the journal include a number of articles that are, in a word, a hoot).*

*The Society remains, with the Association of Asian Studies (AAS), one of the two most important scholarly organizations for the study of Asia. The contrast between the two reflects the fundamental division within the field of American sinology discussed above. The AOS, which is probably most strongly anchored in Middle Eastern and Central Asian studies and is a direct descendant of earlier "orientalist" modes of scholarship, tends to place greatest value on archaeological, philological, and classical research; it devotes little energy to the study of contemporary societies. In the China field, it is most closely associated with sinology reflecting the approaches of the French tradition. The AAS, a creation of the American post-war world, tends to place somewhat greater emphasis on social science research and contemporary studies, is less wedded to detailed philology, does not include the Middle East within its orbit, and tends to emphasize scholarship on China, Japan, and India, with regions such as Southeast Asia and Korea of secondary but significant interest.*

*For many years, the strength of Fairbank-style scholarship on China was so strong as to leave the AOS almost bereft of a Chinese component. However, the revival of philological and text-based sinology in the U.S., the growth of linguistic studies of Classical Chinese, and the increasing strength of diffusionist theories of Chinese cultural origins, which lead sinologists towards Central Asia and the Mesopotamia, have brought sinology back into the forefront of the AOS. This has been reflected in a sharp rise of sinological articles appearing in JAOS over recent years.*

*JAOS includes an excellent book review section, and often includes review articles of important monographs.*

Online through JSTOR (coverage: 1843-2005 or 3 years before present)

## B. The Interwar Period

### i. Europe

*Acta Orientalia*, 1922 - (annual), Copenhagen [PJ 1 .A18]

*Acta Orientalia is the principal outlet of articles of Danish sinology, though its focus is not particularly oriented towards China (despite the long tenure of the sinologist Søren Egerod as editor, 1972-92). Originally, it was a joint publication of Danish, Finnish, Norwegian, and Swedish Oriental Societies. Articles appear in English, French, and German.*

AM *Asia Major* [Old Series] 1924-35, 1944, Leipzig; [New Series] 1949-75, London; [Third Series] 1988 - , (annual) Princeton, N.J.; Academia Sinica, Taiwan [DS 501 .A83]

*This doubly reincarnated journal began as a predominantly German-language outlet for German sinology. It moved to England with its editor, Bruno Schindler (1881-1964), when the Nazi regime's character became clear. (The 1944 issue was the only number published in Germany after Schindler left.) The New series was begun by Schindler and generally represented British sinology, enhanced as it had become by refugee scholars. Denis Twitchett, then at Cambridge was an active contributor, and after the journal died its second death, he revived it at Princeton, to which he had moved. It is now published by Academia Sinica, Taiwan. Originally, AM tended towards highly technical fields: philology, phonology, medieval studies, etc.; but under the broader vision of its current editors, AM has significantly broadened its scope.*

AO *Archiv Orientální*, 1929-88, Prague [DS 1 .A77]

*AO has ceased publication, but it is included here as a reminder that at one time, Czech sinology was a small but significant force in the field. AO was the journal of the Czechoslovak Oriental Institute, and the outlet for major Czech scholars, such as Jaroslav Průšek and Timoteus Pokora. AO was a multi-lingual journal, with English articles a minority. The Soviet occupation of Prague in 1968 was a severe blow to Czech sinology, both Průšek and Pokora were exiled from their posts (though Pokora was able to continue publishing until his death in 1985).*

BMFEA *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities*, 1929 - (annual), Stockholm [DS 714 .S8]

*BMFEA (pronounced "bmfea") is a unique journal. It was founded by the two pioneer sinologists of Sweden, J.G. Andersson (1874-1960) and Bernhard Karlgren (1889-1978). Andersson was an archaeologist, and Karlgren a multi-talented philologist; they shaped the specialization of the journal in their images. BMFEA's most important contribution has been as the outlet of Karlgren's monographs, many of them initially appearing as book-length articles in BMFEA. In the 1970s, Karlgren's student, Hans Bielenstein of Columbia, benefitted from the tradition of monograph-issues of BMFEA by publishing his four-volume history of the Latter Han in consecutive issues of the journal.*

*BMFEA's scale seems much reduced in recent years. It retains a general focus on art and archaeology, but current issues are neither as bulky nor as impressive as in the past.*

Issues for 1929-2001 housed in the ALF.

MS *Monumenta Serica*, 1935 - (annual), St. Augustin, Germany [DS 701 .M81]

*MS began in pre-war Peiping as a journal produced at Fu Jen University, a school established by the Catholic Society of the Divine Word. After the founding of the PRC, Fu Jen was closed (a Taiwan incarnation still exists) and, after a lull*

*of several years, the journal was revived by the Society fathers at their outpost in Japan. Later still, the editorial offices were moved to Germany. Despite the fact that MS has endured several periods of irregular publication and occasionally includes articles that, despite great length, are somewhat eccentric, it is also an outlet for first rate scholarship and is very well produced.*

## ii. United States

*HJAS Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 1936 - (semi-annual since 1977)  
[DS 501 .H3]

*HJAS was founded by Serge Elisséef soon after he became the first director of the harvard-Yenching Institute. Elisséef himself was a japanologist, and the journal has always presented a balance of articles on China and Japan. It has frequently served as an outlet for writers associated with Harvard itself, but accepts articles from anywhere. Traditionally, HJAS has been willing to publish articles in excess of 100 pages, and its book review section also frequently includes very long review articles.*

Online through *JSTOR* (coverage 1936-2003 or five years before present)

## 2. English language sinological journals published in East Asia

*CHHP Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies* (清華學報)

Old Series, 1924-48, Peiping [Film DS 12]; New Series, 1956 - , Taipei [O.C. AS 452 .C485 A2]

*This is a high quality journal that includes articles in both English and Chinese. Abstracts are provided in the alternative languages for each article in the New Series. Although the IU subscription is listed as current, bound issues stop at 1994.*

Articles of current and back numbers may be accessed free online at its home website: <http://thjcs.hss.nthu.edu.tw/english/catalogue.php>

*MTB Memoirs of the Research Department of the Tōyō Bunko*, 1926 - (annual), Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko (東洋文庫) [AS 552 .T64]

*Comp[osed] of articles in English by Japanese scholars. The journal covers all Asia, and articles on China are rare in some periods. Generally, the focus is pre-modern.*

*Journal of Oriental Studies*, 1954 - (semi-annual), University of Hong Kong, Centre of Asian Studies [DS 501 .J86]

*Though there are articles on the modern period, the focus of this journal is primarily traditional. Articles appear in English or Chinese. During the period*

*1981-87, the journal's two yearly issues were split: one for Chinese articles and one for English. It is now co-published by the School of Chinese, University of Hong Kong and the Center for Chinese Language and Cultural Studies, Stanford University.*

*Acta Asiatica*, 1960 - (semi-annual) [DS 1 .A18], Tokyo; Bulletin of the Institute of Eastern Culture, Tōhō Gakkai.

*Articles are in English (in earlier issues often heavily flawed) by Japanese scholars. Beginning in 1970, issues are generally on specialized themes covering all Asia, with China prominent. Some issues have had extremely valuable state-of-the-field articles concerning Japanese scholarship; for example, in v. 58 (on Ch'in-Han studies), v. 60 (on Six Dynasties), v. 66 (on Buddhism).*

*Cahiers d'Extrême Asie* 1985 - (annual), Kyoto [DS 501 .C33]

*Founded by Anna Seidel (1938-91) and generally devoted to the study of Chinese religions, particularly Taoism, the Cahiers ["notebooks"] is the journal of the Kyoto branch of l'École française d'Extrême-Orient.*

### **3. Historical and social science Chinese Studies journals**

*JAS Journal of Asian Studies* 1941 - (quarterly), Ann Arbor: Association for Asian Studies [DS 501 .F2]

-- previously: *FEQ Far Eastern Quarterly*, 1941-56

*This is the most widely subscribed journal in the field (it comes free with membership in the AAS). Articles cover all of Asia, but articles in China are frequent. Sinological articles are rare, to say the least, due to the particular bent of the AAS and the Journal, as described in the survey account above.*

*The AAS is a very important source of book reviews, not because the reviews themselves are of unusual value (they're usually high quality, but brief), but because of the very broad coverage of the book review section. JAS reviews have greater power to shape scholarly response to a book than more detailed reviews in other publications.*

*In recent years, the JAS has commissioned some extremely valuable state-of-the-field articles, which should be standard reading for a number of years to come.*

Online through *JSTOR* (coverage: 1956-2005 or 3 years before present)

*Journal of Asian History*, 1962 - (one-two issues per year), Wiesbaden, Germany; edited at IU [DS 1 .J865]

*The editor of this journal since its inception has been Denis Sinor, of IU's Central Eurasian Studies department. The journal covers all Asia, but articles on China are rare.*

*East Asian History*, 1970 - (semi-annual) Canberra: Department of Far Eastern History, Australian National University [DS 511 .E17]

-- known as *Papers on Far Eastern History*, 1970-1990 [DS 501 .P214 (located in the ALF)]

*A consistently high quality journal, whose papers confirm the strength of Chinese history at A.N.U.*

#### **4. Disciplinary journals (philosophy, literature, science, art)**

##### **i. Philosophy**

*PEW Philosophy East and West*, 1951- (quarterly), Honolulu: University of Hawaii [B 1.P574]

*Primarily devoted to Indian and Chinese philosophy, PEW includes much comparative philosophy and general studies. It has served in the past as an important conduit for interaction between Chinese and Western specialists in philosophy. The dominant force at PEW has been for some time Roger Ames, of Hawaii. It includes valuable reviews.*

Online through JSTOR (coverage 1951-2005 or three years before present)

*Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 1974- (annual), edited at the University of Hawaii. [B 5230 .A1 J67]

*More specialized than PEW, but not of higher quality. Stress on comparative philosophy and general conceptual issues.*

Online through EBSCO:

<http://ejournals.ebsco.com/Journal2.asp?JournalID=105321>

(1974-current)

##### **ii. Literature**

*Tamkang Review*, 1970 (quarterly), Taipei: Tamkang University [PL 2274 .T15]

*A journal of comparative literature. (Earlier journal in the field: Literature East and West.)*

*CLEAR Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, and Reviews*, 1979 - (annual), Bloomington: Indiana University [PL 2250 .C52]



*CLEAR has become a major outlet for comparativist scholarship. It includes both sinologically and theoretically oriented articles covering both traditional and modern periods, and valuable reviews.*

Online through JSTOR (coverage: 1979-2003 or 3 years before present)

### iii. Science

*East Asian Science, Technology, and Medicine*, 1999 - [Q 145 .C48]

-- formerly, *Chinese Science*, 1975-98 (annual), University of Pennsylvania

*A specialized journal on the history of Chinese science, founded by Nathan Sivin (MIT, University of Pennsylvania); now edited by Ben Elman of Princeton. The articles are of high quality in a field that was once confined to Joseph Needham's research teams (surviving members of which still publish in the small journal).*

### iv. Religion

*Journal of Chinese Religion*, 1981 - (annual)

-- formerly, *Bulletin of the Society for the Study of Chinese Religions*, 1975-80

*Among the journal's strengths is its extensive book review section.*

Online through EBSCO (1982-2007)

### v. Art

*Artibus Asiae*, 1925 - , New York: Chinese Art Society of America; Washington, D.C.  
[Fine Arts Lib. N 8 .A79]

*The oldest, and viewed by many as the most prestigious of East Asian art journals. It is now produced by the Sackler Gallery of the Smithsonian Institution.*

Online through JSTOR (coverage: 1979-2003 or 5 years before present)

*Ars Orientalis*, 1954 - (annual), Ann Arbor: University of Michigan [Fine Arts Lib. N

*The journal of the Freer Gallery of Art of the Smithsonian Institution, Ars Orientalis has alternated between bases Washington and Ann Arbor.*

Online through JSTOR (coverage: 1979-2004) or WilsonWeb (1984-2005)

*Oriental Art*, 1948 - (new series 1955 - ), London [Fine Arts Lib. N 8 .069]

## 5. Historical small journals and newsletters in the U.S.

Starting from the late 1960s, members of the China Studies field devoted to particular periods of Chinese history and culture began to initiate small, informal

newsletter-like journals. Initially, these journals were funded at very low levels, and their founders viewed them more as means of building scholarly communication and consolidating fields of historical enterprise than as outlets for high quality scholarship. These newsletters tended to include bibliography, announcements of conferences, round-table discussions, and gossip. In many cases, publication schedules were extremely erratic (one Six Dynasties period newsletter seems not to have survived). In time, the more successful of these newsletters evolved into true journals. In a few cases, they have become highly prestigious research outlets. In one or two, the urge to legitimacy has even effectively eliminated the engaging news-of-the-field function.

*Early China*, 1975 - (annual, irregular), Berkeley [DS 701 .E17]

*Initially organized by David Keightley of Berkeley as a newsletter and outlet for highly technical scholarship, Early China has grown into a very hefty and well produced journal. It includes articles on periods through early Six Dynasties, though its focus is earlier. Its newsletter origins are reflected in sections on news of the field, current bibliography, summaries of Japanese scholarship, and dissertation abstracts. Its base remains at Berkeley's Institute for East Asian Studies.*

*T'ang Studies*, 1982 - (semi-annual), Boulder, Co.: University of Colorado [DS 749.3 .T3]

*This journal and three that follow took time to develop into recognized outlets of strong scholarship, but they are now well-established.*

*Journal of Sung and Yuan Studies*, 1970 - (annual) [DS 751 .S9S]

-- formerly *Bulletin of Sung and Yuan Studies*, 1978-89  
*Sung Studies Newsletter*, 1970-77

*After several name changes and erratic publication schedules, this journal has attained a firm footing as an annual.*

*Ming Studies*, 1975 - (annual/semi-annual) [DS 753 .M594]

*Attracts leading scholars after a somewhat rocky start.*

*Late Imperial China*, 1985 - (annual), L.A.: California Institute of Technology  
 [DS 754 .A2 C53]

-- formerly *Ch'ing-shih wen-ti*, 1965-1985

*The oldest of the "newsletter" type premodern journals, Late Imperial China, like Early China, has become one of the most important outlets of historical scholarship on its period. It is now edited by James Lee (Cal Tech) and Charlotte Furth, who are historians.*

Online at Periodicals Archive Online (PAO): (1985-95) and Project Muse (1996-current)

-- Two journals devoted to post-traditional China are listed below:

*Twentieth-Century China*, 1997 - (bi-annual) [DS 774 .C544]

-- formerly *Republican China*, 1984-97; *Chinese Republican Studies Newsletter*, 1975-83

*At one time, this was the most disputatious journal in the field as "right-" and "left-wing" members of Republican historical and political studies battled it out with entertaining polemics, frequently ad hominem. It has now cooled into a more decorous mode and is almost solely composed of research articles.*

Online at Project Muse (only 2007-current)

*Modern China*, 1975 - (quarterly), Beverley Hills: Sage Publications [DS 701 .M712]

*Founded and edited by Philip Huang, a social historian at UCLA, this is the most fully evolved of all the newsletter journals (though it retains virtually no trace of newsletter origins), as its publication schedule (and the fact that it is commercially produced) indicates. Despite its title, it does include articles devoted to the Late Imperial period, particularly in the area of social history.*

Online through JSTOR (coverage: 1975-2005 or 3 years before present)

## 6. Review journal

*China Review International*, 1994 - (semi-annual), Honolulu [DS 706 .C51115]

*This journal is devoted to sustained reviews, which serve as a valuable supplement to reviews in more established journals, both because of the space individual reviews are allocated, and because of the broad range that this specialized publication is able to achieve. Features such as round-table discussions are also included, and the journal makes for very lively reading. It treats Chinese as well as Western language books.*

Online at Project Muse (1999-current)

## 7. Translation journal

*Renditions*, 1973 - (Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong) [PL 2658 .E1 R39]

*Renditions is principally devoted to translations and articles on translation covering both premodern and modern periods. There are many thematic issues.*

## 8. News of the Field

A number of China Studies and Asian Studies organizations publish newsletters. Among the most interesting have been two that outlived their eras, but reflect much about the state of East Asian and China area studies in their time, and warrant mention in the context of a field history:

*Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, 1969-2000, Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars [DS 501 .B93]

*A product of the Vietnam War era, this bulletin recorded (from the Left) the views of East Asian scholars during difficult times, with Chinese studies scholars being particularly prominent (likely because, during the earlier years of the publication, there was still attachment to the imagined possibilities of the Maoist era). Those who chose not to publish in or read the BCAS were presumably “unconcerned.”*

*China Exchange News*, 1973-96 (Washington, D.C.) [DS 777.55 .C5254]

*Newsletter of the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the China (CSCC, known from 1966-93 as the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People’s Republic of China [CSCPRC]). This organization was, from 1972, the most important conduit for academic links with the PRC, and funded hundreds of visiting researchers. It was coordinated through the National Academy of Sciences, in cooperation with the ACLS and Social Science Research Council (which now, as a joint committee, administer the CSCC). The articles in the newsletter consist largely of research reports of scholars returned from exchange research trip under Committee auspices or fellowships; they are designed to orient or update members of the field on research conditions, restrictions, protocols, and so forth. The newsletter ceased publication this year in response to decreases in budget, but for the next few years, its later issues will continue to be of unique value. The Spring 1996 issue, which includes retrospectives of the CSCC’s first thirty years, is particularly worth reading.*